

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for reviewing and considering the pending application. Applicants further thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 11 is allowed. The *Office Action* dated November 1, 2007 has been received and its contents reviewed.

Claims 1 and 8 are hereby amended. Claims 7 and 11 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 8-10 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,226 (hereinafter *Hougy*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,101,191 (hereinafter *MacFadyen*) and U.S. Patent No. 4,855,730 (*Venners*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” Applicants submit that *Hougy*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claim 1.

For example, *Hougy*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, taken singularly or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a system for remote controlling and monitoring a home appliance, comprising a first home appliance that “reads information of the second home appliance to set communication speed and packet length corresponding to the information, wherein if the amount of the data is more than a preset amount, then the packet is constituted by being divided and the communication speed is adjusted,” as recited in independent claim 1. This subject matter is substantially similar to the subject matter of dependent claim 11, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and passage of the present application to issue.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 6, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,922,050 (hereinafter *Madany*) in view of *MacFadyen* and *Venners*.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” Applicants submit that *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claim 1.

For example, *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, taken singularly or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a system for remote controlling and monitoring a home appliance, comprising a first home appliance that “reads information of the second home appliance to set communication speed and packet length corresponding to the information, wherein if the amount of the data is more than a preset amount, then the packet is constituted by being divided and the communication speed is adjusted,” as recited in independent claim 1. This subject matter is substantially similar to the subject matter of dependent claim 11, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and passage of the present application to issue.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, *Venners*, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,008,879 (hereinafter *Fischer*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As previously discussed, *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, taken singularly or in combination, do not disclose all the features recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claims

3-5 depend. In addition, *Fischer* fails to cure the shortcomings of *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venner*. This subject matter is substantially similar to the subject matter of dependent claim 11, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and passage of the present application to issue.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fischer* in view of *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” Applicants submit that *Fischer*, *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, singularly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim independent claim 8.

For example, claim 8 recites a method for remote controlling and monitoring a home appliance, in which a system and a method for remote controlling and monitoring a home appliance are provided with a first home appliance, a second home appliance, and a communication line path for communication between the first and second home appliances, comprising, *inter alia*, a first appliance “configured to start communication with a next second home appliance only after transmitting the first packet to the second home appliance and receiving the second packet from the second home appliance, wherein if the amount of the user command data is more than a preset amount, then the first packet is constituted by being divided and the communication speed is adjusted.” As indicated, claim 8 now incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 11 therein. Applicants further submit that *Fischer*, *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features, as recited. This is further evidenced by the fact that the Office acknowledges that this subject matter, as recited, is allowable over the prior art. See *Office Action* at page 26.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fischer* in view of *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, *Venners*, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,170,405 (hereinafter *Daum*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As previously discussed, *Fischer*, *Madany*, *MacFadyen*, and *Venners*, taken singularly or in combination, do not disclose all the features recited in independent claim 8, the base claim from which claim 10 depends. For example, independent claim 8 now incorporates the subject matter of claim 11 therein. The Office acknowledges that this subject matter is allowable. See *Office Action* at page 26. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable over these cited references and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants have amended claim 8 to correct the typographical error in accordance with the Office's comments on page 27. As such, Applicants submit that claim 8 is now in condition for allowance.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

U.S. Application No.: 10/506,329
Response dated February 29, 2008
Response to *Office Action* dated November 1, 2007

Docket No.: 7950.028.00

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael R. Argent (Reg. No. 46,522)
for Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant